

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 14-28 are pending in the application. Applicant amends claim 1, cancels claims 19, 22, 23, 26 and 27, and adds new claim 29 herein. Support for the amendments and new claim can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 19, 22, 23, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant cancels claims 19, 22, 23, 26 and 27 herein. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 17-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (U.S. Pat. No. 6,107,685). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding Applicant's traverse and solely in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claim 1.

Among other features, amended claim 1 now recites that the circuit elements are one of resistors and capacitors. Amended claim 1 now also recites that the circuit elements connected to the electrode pairs with the second lands are also connected to electrodes with lands other than the first lands, and positions of the circuit elements are

offset in a plan view such that the circuit elements are laterally displaced from a shortest path between a center of each electrode of the electrode pairs with the second lands.

It is a longstanding rule that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 180 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1974), see MPEP §2143.03. Furthermore, when evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, all of the limitations must be considered and given weight. Ex parte Grasselli, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), MPEP § 2144.03. Here, the alleged combination fails to disclose circuit elements that are one of resistors and capacitors, as well as circuit elements that interconnect electrodes.

More particularly, the Office Action alleges that the wirings 39 of Nishiyama correspond to the previously claimed circuit elements which were recited as being one of "resistive elements" and "dielectrics". Although Applicant does not necessarily agree that the wirings 39 would be considered a "resistive element" by one skilled in the art giving that phrase its ordinary meaning in the art, the phrase "resistive elements" is now changed in claim 1 to "resistors". In accordance with the change to "resistor", Applicant also changes "dielectrics" in claim 1 to "capacitors". Clearly the wirings 39 of Nishiyama (re-arrangement wires) are neither "resistors" nor "capacitors".

Further, claim 1 recites that the circuit elements connected to the electrode pairs with the second lands are also connected to electrodes with lands other than the first lands. That is, the circuit elements interconnect electrodes. Referring to Fig. 5 of Nishiyama, it can be clearly seen that the wirings 39 do not connect pairs of lands to each other and therefore also do not connect electrodes to each other.

It should also be noted that the Office Action alleges that Nishiyama teaches a plurality of conductive balls 6 that are respectively fixedly bonded to the lands by fixedly bonded members (Fig. 6d). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Instead, Nishiyama's numeral '6' refers to a bump and not to a conductive ball. Further, the Office Action asserts that the conductive balls are substantially equal in size to one another (column 2 lines 20-60). Since Nishiyama does not teach conductive balls, Nishiyama is also silent with respect to their size. Nishiyama contains no disclosure regarding an arrangement wherein "the balls are equal in size and the lands are different in size" as described in the present application.

Inasmuch as the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the prior art cannot render claim 1 unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24 and 25 depend from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 19, 22, 23, 26 and 27 are cancelled.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (U.S. Pat. No. 6,107,685) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Zeng (U.S. Pat. No. 7,070,088). Claim 14 depends from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 6 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (U.S. Pat. No. 6,107,685) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Huang (U.S. Pat. No. 5,172,471). Claims 6 and 28 depend from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (U.S. Pat. No. 6,107,685) as applied to claim 2 and further in view of Huang (U.S. Pat. No. 5,172,471). Claim 15 depends from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama (U.S. Pat. No. 6,107,685) as applied to claim 3 and further in view of Huang (U.S. Pat. No. 5,172,471). Claim 16 depends from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

NEW CLAIMS

New claim 29 is added. Support for this new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration of this new claim.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 21, 2010

By: /Bryant E. Wade/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/pvd